

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 9, 11 and 20-22 are amended to correct informalities. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Richer at the interview held June 12, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

**I. Objection To The Claims**

The Office Action objects to claims 9 and 20-21 for containing informalities. By this Amendment, claims 9 and 20-21 are amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

**II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied References**

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-18 and 22-25 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,333,071 to Baudisch (Baudisch '071); (2) rejects claims 6, 8, 10, 14-15, 19 and 26-27 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of Baudisch '071 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,812,907 to Gennetten; (3) rejects claim 9 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of Baudisch '071 in view of Gennetten and U.S. Patent No. 6,803,884 to Ohzawa; and (4) rejects claims 20-21 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-8 of Baudisch '071 in view of Ohzawa.

Filed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer over Baudisch '071, rendering the rejections moot.

The Office Action (1) provisionally rejects claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-18 and 22-25 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/015,642 to Baudisch (Baudisch '642); (2) provisionally rejects claims 6,

8, 10, 14-15, 19 and 26-27 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of Baudisch '642 in view of Gennetten; (3) rejects claim 9 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of Baudisch '642 in view of Gennetten and Ohzawa; and (4) rejects claims 20-21 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-22 of Baudisch '642 in view of Ohzawa.

Filed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer over Baudisch '642, rendering the rejections moot.

The Office Action (1) provisionally rejects claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-18 and 22-25 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/015,680 to Baudisch (Baudisch '680); (2) provisionally rejects claims 6, 8, 10, 14-15, 19 and 26-27 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-21 of Baudisch '680 in view of Gennetten; (3) rejects claim 9 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-21 of Baudisch '680 in view of Gennetten and Ohzawa; and (4) rejects claims 20-21 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-21 of Baudisch '642 in view of Ohzawa.

Filed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer over Baudisch '680, rendering the rejections moot.

The Office Action: (1) rejects claims 1, 4-5, 7, 11, 16-18, 21-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,748,189 to Trueblood; (2) rejects claims 2-3, 12-13 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Trueblood; and (3) rejects claims 6, 8-10, 14-15, 19-20 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Trueblood in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,812,907 to Gennetten. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Regarding independent claims 1, 11 and 22, Trueblood fails to disclose (1) "an image replicator configured to generate different first and second scale factors necessary to scale the first and second image information data for display on the first and second display devices"

and (2) "the first and second display devices being so constructed and arranged such that when the first image information data is displayed on the first display device and the second image information data is displayed on the second display device the resulting displayed single image appears to be substantially continuous across the first and second display areas to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the first display area is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on the second display area" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 11 and 22.

Regarding independent claims 1, 11 and 21, the Office Action cites to Trueblood, Figs. 4-5; col. 1, lines 29-44; col. 6, lines 53-66; col. 7, lines 46-54; col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 11; and col. 8, lines 5-11 in the rejection. Trueblood discloses a system for allowing input devices to be used with multiple displays (Figs. 4-5) each having its own graphics card able to have different resolutions (col. 7, lines 46-54 and col. 8, lines 5-11). Trueblood does not disclose scaling images, and scaling is not suggested by Trueblood. Instead, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Trueblood discloses scaling mouse movement. For example, Trueblood discloses that each screen has transition windows located at the boundaries of the screen (Fig. 4). A peripheral manager determines when a mouse cursor enters a transition window, and when a mouse cursor enters the window, the peripheral manager causes the mouse cursor to appear in the appropriate new screen (col. 9, lines 16-31). Trueblood discloses, relative to Fig. 8, that if the primary screen 110 and secondary screen 108 do not have identical size and resolution, the peripheral manager 122 must perform a scaling function when simulating cursor movements on primary screen 110 for display on new screen 108 (col. 11, lines 13-21).

Trueblood does not disclose scaling images, and thus does not disclose an image across two screens that has portions scaled by different scale factors. Trueblood, is only

concerned about the treatment of mouse transitions across screen boundaries. For example, Trueblood clearly states that as a mouse cursor crosses a boundary, it will be simulated on a new screen while masked on the old screen (col. 11, lines 13-27, especially at lines 23-25 "the user is to see the cursor only on the new screen 108").

As discussed at the personal interview, while Trueblood discloses that one use of Trueblood's system is to monitor air space at an airport, Trueblood never indicates that the monitored airspace must be presented to the user as a continuous, smoothly transitioning image. Instead, as explained at the personal interview, absent any disclosure by Trueblood to the contrary, one equally plausible interpretation is that the displays of Trueblood act in a manner similar to the displays in a Mall security system. That is, Trueblood's displays could each display a different part of the airport air space, but without the displayed images matching up so that a continuous, smoothly transitioned image spans the displays. This is further plausible because many airports have areas between runways that have grass as well as other areas on which planes and passengers will not go. Thus, a system to manage airspace would not need to display or monitor these areas. As explained at the personal interview, because Trueblood's airspace example can be interpreted such that continuous image display across multiple displays is not a part of Trueblood's system, a capability to display images continuously across two or more displays is not inherent in Trueblood's disclosure.

Gennetten and Ohzawa, as previously discussed in the record, do not disclose display of an image across multiple displays having different scale factors. Thus, the feature of displaying an image across multiple displays wherein the portions of the image are at different resolutions is novel over the applied references, and would not have been obvious in view of the applied references.

For the forgoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose  
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/jhb

Attachment:  
Terminal Disclaimer

Date: June 16, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--